

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/176,124	10)/21/1998	GERHARD SCHNEIDER	10191/857	7808		
26646	7590	06/04/2002					
KENYON &		N	EXAMINER				
ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004				TUNG, TA	A HSUNG		
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				1743	24.		
				DATE MAILED: 06/04/2002	∞ /. ·		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MERY

	1 3/ .	lo.	Applicant(s)		12-0	
Office Action Commons	07/176	124	SCHA	Veiner	122 FC	
Office Action Summary	Examiner		<i>a</i>	Group Art Unit	1	, 1.5
		(_ : CL	1 NG	1743	1'ape	No
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	s on the cover	sheet be	neath the c	orrespondence a	address –	
eriod for Reply		~				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TOP THIS COMMUNICATION.	O EXPIRE	<u>/</u>	MONTH(S) FROM THE M	AILING D	ATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reference of the period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defaute a Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by start any reply received by the Office later than three months after the matern adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	eply within the sta It, expire SIX (6) M Itute, cause the ap	tutory mini ONTHS fro oplication to	mum of thirty on the mailing obecome ABA	(30) days will be conducted of this community (NDONED) (35 U.S.C.	sidered time lication. § 133).	e ły.
tatus/						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\frac{\sqrt{-17}}{}$	-02_					<u>_</u> ·
☐ This action is FINAL.			•			
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 193				to the merits is	closed in	
Disposition of Claims						
☑ Claim(s) 1, 3-7		··	is/are	pending in the ap	plication.	
Of the above claim(s)			is/are	withdrawn from c	onsiderati	on.
□ Claim(s)						
□ Claim(s) (3-7			is/are	rejected.		
□ Claim(s)			is/are	objected to.		
☐ Claim(s)					or election	on
pplication Papers			requin	ement		
ppiloadoli Fapeis	is □ an	-	☐ disapprov	/ed.		
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	-				·	
= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	-	xaminer				
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	-	xaminer				
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are object	-	xaminer				
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are objected. □ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected. □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. 	-	xaminer				
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are objected. □ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected. □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. 	cted to by the E		-(d).			
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath of declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	cted to by the E		-(d).			
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are objection. ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objection. ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to be objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to be objecte	cted to by the E		-(d).			
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	cted to by the E under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119 (a)				
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	under 35 U.S.C. received.	§ 119 (a)		· ·		
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	under 35 U.S.C. received. received in Apples have been real Bureau (PCT I	§ 119 (a) ication No ceived Rule 17.2(oa))			
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	under 35 U.S.C. received. received in Apples have been real Bureau (PCT I	§ 119 (a) ication No ceived Rule 17.2(oa))			
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	under 35 U.S.C. received. received in Apples have been real Bureau (PCT I	§ 119 (a) ication No ceived Rule 17.2(oa))			
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	under 35 U.S.C. received. received in Apples have been real Bureau (PCT I	§ 119 (a) ication No ceived Rule 17.2	oa))			
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	under 35 U.S.C. received. received in Apples have been real Bureau (PCT I	§ 119 (a) ication Noceived Rule 17.2	a)) terview Sum	nmary, PTO-413		O-152
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	under 35 U.S.C. received. received in Apples have been real Bureau (PCT I	§ 119 (a) ication Noceived Rule 17.2(a)) terview Sum otice of Info	·	cation, PT	

Application/Control Number: 09/176,124

Art Unit: 1102

Claims 1, 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamada '806 or Yamada '807.

Applicant argues that in '806 the bottom layer in figure 9 can not be considered as the "covering layer" presumably because it is the oxygen pumping layer and is actually a part of the oxygen measuring cell.

This argument is not persuasive. Applicant's claim language does not in any fashion exclude a pumping layer from being a "covering layer". Also, the wording "a measuring cell layer" (claim 1, line 4) is non-specific as to its detailed structure and is seen to be met by the concentration cell layer 13 (top layer in figue 9) of Yamada 806. Applicant is not permitted to claim an apparatus feature broadly and then argue that the language has a hidden narrow meaning that defines over the prior art. He may not have it both ways.

Incidentally, the top layer in figure 9 is mislabelled as 13'a, which is actually one of the two intermediate layers. In this regard, see the discussion at col. 6, lines 37-42, which states that the intermediate layers 13'a and 13'b are sandwiched by top and bottom layers 13.

As for '807, the argument is similar to that against '806 and is similarly non-persuasive. Further, it is argued that the top insulating board 6, 26 prevents the heat from being distributed homogeneously over a cross-section of the sensor element.

This further argument is also not persuasive. The insulating board is apparently_electrically-insulating, not thermally-insulating, and therefore should not affect the homogeneous distribution of heat. In any event, since the bottom insulating board 3, 23 of the heating element

Application/Control Number: 09/176,124

Art Unit: 1102

is made of the same material (alumina, spinel) as the top insulating board, whatever effect the insulating boards have on heat distribution should be the same over a cross-section of the sensor element.

Claims 1, 3-7are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider etal '677 in view of Yamad '806 or Yamada '807.

Applicant argues that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the references absent his own teaching.

This argument is not persuasive. It is common knowledge that electrolytic measurement is temperature-sensitive. Therefore, uneven heating that may lead to temperature gradient between different parts of a sensor element may lead to erroreous results. Also, it is fundamental physics that significant temperature gradient between different portions of one element can cause cracking from thermal stress. Applicant may not preempt an examiner's reliance upon common scientific principles as motivation for combining references by lising these principles in his specification. Otherwise, an applicant can merely set forth in his disclosure all possible reasons including well-known axioms for combining references and thus preclude any manner of combining references to reject a claim.

In regard to the wording of claim 3 as to the number of layers that is present in the final product of the measuring cell layer and the covering layer, applicant's refusal to address this issue is taken to mean that the language includes the situation wherein only one layer is present in each of the measuring cell layer and the covering layer.

Application/Control Number: 09/176,124 Page 4

Art Unit: 1102

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The examiner can be reached at 703-308-3329. His supervisor Jill Warden can be reached at 703-308-4037. Any general inquirys should be directed to the receptionist at 703-308-0661. A fax number for TC 1700 is 703-872-9311.

Ta Tung

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1743